

Message Text

PAGE 01 NATO 02953 01 OF 02 282157Z

71

ACTION SS-30

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 SSO-00 NSCE-00 /031 W

----- 064213

O R 282010Z MAY 74

FM USMISSION NATO

TO SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 5941

INFO ALL NATO CAPITALS 4028

S E C R E T SECTION 1 OF 2 USNATO 2953

EXDIS

E.O. 11652: GDS

TAGS:PFOR, NATO

SUBJECT: NATO DECLARATION: COMMENTARY ON LATEST DRAFT

REF: STATE 110842

BEGIN SUMMARY: MESSAGE DESCRIBES THE PRIMARY ISSUES RELATING TO EACH SECTION OF THE NATO DECLARATION(SEE SEPTTEL) AS IT STANDS FOLLOWING SPC DISCUSSIONS ON MAY 27-28. WHERE APPROPRIATE, RECOMMENDATIONS ARE OFFERED AND GUIDANCE REQUESTED. NAC WILL REVIEW THIS DRAFT AT MEETING ON WEDNESDAY, MAY 29. END SUMMARY.

1. PARAGRAPH 1.

THE TEXT OF THIS PARAGRAPH FOLLOWS CLOSELY THE PROPLSED CHANGE IN THE IK DRAFT RECOMMENDED BY THE DEPARTMENT IN REFTTEL. OMISSION OF WORDS "UNPRECEDENTED PROSPERITY" IS ATTRIBUTABLE LARGELY TO A BRITISH CONCERN THAT MANY READERS OF THE DECLARATION MIGHT NOT FIND THOSE WORDS VERY APPROPRIATE THESE DAYS.

2. PARAGRAPH 2

THE PRINCIPAL ISSUE IN THIS PARAGRAPH IS WHETHER THE ALLIANCE CAN BE CONSIDERED AN "INSTRUMENT" FOR PURSUING DETENTE. FRENCH STRENUOUSLY OBJECT TO THIS CONCEPT, VIEWING THE ALLIANCE AS ESSENTIALLY ANALLIANCE FOR DEFENSE PURPOSES, AND WISHING TO CIRCUMSCRIBE ITS ROLE IN OTHER FIELDS. OTHER ALLIES REJECT THIS RESTRICTIVE FRENCH VIEW OF THE ALLIANCE BUT ARE WILLING TO CONSIDER ALTERNATIVES WHICH OMIT THE WORD "INSTRUMENT" WHILE PRESERVING SECRET

PAGE 02 NATO 02953 01 OF 02 282157Z

FOR THE ALLIANCE AROLE IN DETENTE AS PROVIDED FOR IN THE HARMEL REPORT. MISSION UNDERSTANDS FROM GUIDANCE CONTAINED REFTTEL THAT DEPARTMENT IS PREPARED TO CONSIDER ALTERNATIVE WORDING WHICH IS CONSISTENT WITH THE SPIRIT OF THE HARMEL REPORT. ANOTHER ISSUE IN

THIS PARAGRAPH IS WHETHER TO APPLY THE ADJECTIVE "SECURITY" TO THE TIES WHICH UNITE THE ALLIES. THOSE FAVORING THE INCLUSION OF THE ADJECTIVE, WHICH INCLUDES THE BRITISH, ARGUE THAT THE REFERENCE TO GENERAL COMPLETE AND CONTROLLED DISARMAMENT, MEANS THAT ONLY THE SECURITY TIES OF THE ALLIANCE MIGHT BE DISSOLVED IF GCD WERE ACHIEVED AND THAT OTHER TIES WOULD NOT BE AFFECTED. OTHER ALLIES, ESPECIALLY CANADA, ARGUE FOR DELETION OF THE ADJECTIVE "SECURITY" ON GROUNDS THAT THE LANGUAGE IMPLIES THAT THE TIES WHICH NOW UNITE THE ALLIES ARE LIMITED TO SECURITY. A MAJORITY CURRENTLY FAVORS DELETION OF THE ADJECTIVE, THE BRITISH DELEGATION HERE IS INCLINED TO DROP IT, AND THE MISSION RECOMMENDS THAT WE BE AUTHORIZED TO JOIN A CONSENSUS IN DROPPING THE WORD IF FUTURE DEBATE LEADS TO THAT CONCLUSION.

3. PARAGRAPHS 3-8

FOLLOWING THE FIRST SPC DISCUSSION OF THE TEXT ON MAY 27, THE BRITISH DELEGATION NEGOTIATED WITH THE FRENCH DELEGATION A RESTRUCTURING OF THESE PARAGRAPHS GENERALLY FOLLOWING AN ARRANGEMENT PREFERRED BY THE FRENCH, AND INCLUDING TWO POINTS OF INTEREST TO THE FRENCH (THE IDEAS IN THE SENTENCES INCLUDING THE PHRASES "DOMINATION OF THE WORLD" AND "THE ULTIMATE AIM OF ANY DEFENSE POLICY") WHICH THE REFTEL GAVE US AUTHORITY TO ACCEPT, AND INCLUDING ALSO ALL POINTS WHICH BRITISH DELEGATION JUDGED WERE IMPORTANT TO LONDON. THE UK DELEGATION ADVISES US THAT IT IS RECOMMENDING TO LONDON ACCEPTANCE OF PARAGRAPHS 3-8 IN THEIR PRESENT FORM AS THE BASIS FOR FURTHER DISCUSSION. THIS WOULD, OF COURSE, INCLUDE SPECIFIC UNRESOLVED ISSUES AS INDICATED BY BRACKETS. IN KEEPING WITH GUIDANCE CONTAINED REFTEL TO REMAIN IN STEP WITH UK DELEGATION, US REP IN SPC STATED HE WOULD REFER THESE PARAGRAPHS TO WASHINGTON. MISSION RECOMMENDS THAT WASHINGTON GIVE FAVORABLE CONSIDERATION TO THE STRUCTURAL ARRANGEMENT OF THIS SECTION OF THE DOCUMENT WHILE, OF COURSE, ADDRESSING THE SPECIFIC UNRESOLVED ISSUES INDIVIDUALLY ON THEIR MERITS. COMMENT ON THESE SPECIFIC ISSUES FOLLOWS BELOW:

A. PARAGRAPH 3- AFTER CONSULTING WITH UK DELEGATION WHICH REACTED FAVORABLY TO TEXT CONTAINED IN STATE 110919, US REP
SECRET

PAGE 03 NATO 02953 01 OF 02 282157Z

INTRODUCED THIS LANGUAGE IN SPC. UK AND NETHERLANDS DELEGATIONS SUPPORTED IT BUT MAJORITY OF OTHERS OPPOSED THE LANGUAGE ON GROUNDS THAT "THE BALANCE OF POWER" WAS A TERM WHICH WAS INADEQUATE TO DESCRIBE THE RESULTS OF THE LOSS OF THE INDEPENDENCE OF A MEMBER OF THE ALLIANCE. GERMANY ARGUED PARTICULARLY FORCEFULLY ON THIS POINT. OTHER DELEGATIONS ARGUED THAT THE CONCEPT OF "BALANCE OF POWER" WOULD NOT STRIKE A RESPONSIVE CHORD WITH THEIR PARLIAMENTARIANS AND PUBLICS. UK DELEGATION HAS TOLD US PRIVATELY THEY ARE INCLINED TO RETURN TO THE ORIGINAL TEXT. MISSION SUGGESTS THAT WE BE AUTHORIZED TO SUPPORT ORIGINAL TEXT (FIRST BRACKETED ALTERNATIVE IN PARAGRAPH 3.).

B. PARAGRAPH 4- FRENCH CONTINUE TO DESIRE A REFERENCE TO

"VULNERABILITY " IN THE DECLARATION AND HAVE INCLUDED IT AT THIS POINT. IK DELEGATION BELIEVES THAT LONDON CAN PROBABLY ACCEPT THE LANGUAGE THAT THE FRENCH PROPOSE WHICH, AS THE DEPARTMENT WILL NOTE, HAS BEEN SUBSTANTIALLY DEFANGED IN COMPARISON WITH PREVIOUS DRAFTS WHICH DREW ATTENTION TO THE DIFFERENCE IN VULNERABILITY AS BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND EUROPE. MISSION RECOMMENDS THAT WE BE AUTHORIZED TO ACCEPT THIS LANGUAGE OR BE PROVIDED WITH ARGUMENTATION AS TO WHY IT IS OBJECTIONABLE.

C. PARAGRAPH 5- THE FRENCH, SUPPORTED BY THE ITALIANS, SPOKE IN FAVOR OF THE ORIGINAL FRENCH " NO ALTERNATIVE AT PRESENT", WHEREAS MOST OTHER DELEGATIONS SUPPORT THE FORMULS "NO ALTERNATIVE IN THE FORESEEABLE FUTURE" TO THE SECURITY PROVIDED... BY THE US NUCLEAR FORCES... UK DELEGATION, HOWEVER, STATED IN SPC THAT IT THOUGHT LONDON MIGHT ACCEPT PUTTING THE WORK "PRESENT" BEFORE THE WORD "ALTERNATIVE," WHICH THE UK REP SUGGESTED, GAVE LESS OF AN IMPRESSION OF IMMINENCE THAN THE FORMULA "AT PRESENT." THIS WAS ACCEPTED BY FRANCE AND NOW APPEARS IN TEXT. THE CANADIAN DELEGATION PROPOSED AN ALTERNATIVE FORMULA ON THIS POINT (FOOTNOTE 1) WHICH WOULD CONSIST OF REVISING THE SECOND SENTENCE AS FOLLOWS: " WHILE THE COMMITMENT OF ALL THE ALLIES TO THE COMMON DEFENSE REDUCES THE RISK OF EXTERNAL AGGRESSION, THE CONTRIBUTION TO THE ALLIANCE SECURITY IN EUROPE PROVIDED BY THE NUCLEAR FORCES OF THE UNITED STATES BASED IN THE UNITED STATES AND EUROPE, AND THE PRESENCE OF NORTH AMERICAN FORCES IN EUROPE CONTINUES TO BE NECESSARY." AFTER FRENCH REP STATED THAT THIS WAS AN "INTERESTING IDEA", US REP ALSO COMMENTED THAT IT SOUNDED INTERESTING AND THAT HE FELT THAT THE PROPOSAL TO PUT THE WORD "PRESENT" BEFORE THE WORD " ALTERNATIVE," WHILE
SECRET

PAGE 04 NATO 02953 01 OF 02 282157Z

PERHAPS A SLIGHT IMPROVEMENT, STILL PRESENTED PROBLEMS. MISSION RECOMMENDS THAT WE BE AUTHORIZED TO ACCEPT THE CANADIAN PROPOSAL, ALTHOUGH DEPARTMENT SHOULD RECOGNIZE THAT THE MAJORITY OF DELEGATIONS, PRESUMABLY INCLUDING THE UK , WOULD BE PREPARE TO ACCEPT THE "NO PRESENT ALTERNATIVE" FORMULA.

SECRET

PAGE 01 NATO 02953 02 OF 02 282250Z

71
ACTION SS-30

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 SSO-00 NSCE-00 /031 W
----- 064836

O R 282010Z MAY 74
FM USMISSION NATO
TO SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 5942
INFO ALL NATO CAPITALS 4029

S E C R E T SECTION 2 OF 2 USNATO 2953

EXDIS

THE LAST TWO SENTENCES IN PARAGRAPH 5 ARE BRACKETED BECAUSE OF OPPOSITION BY THE FRENCH TO THE REFERENCE TO "OTHER PARTS OF THE WORLD." NETHERLANDS DELEGATION, HOWEVER, ALSO OPPOSES THIS LANGUAGE FOR THE SAME REASONS ADDUCED BY THE FRENCH. NORWEGIAN DELEGATE TOLD US PRIVATELY THAT HIS AUTHORITIES ARE ALSO UNHAPPY WITH IT BECAUSE IT WILL ELICIT ADVERSE COMMENTS FROM THE NORWEGIAN PARLIAMENT ABOUT US ROLE IN VIETNAM. SIMILAR CONCERNS WERE VOICED TO US PRIVATELY BY NETHERLANDS REP. HOWEVER, NETHERLANDS REP SAID THAT THE HAGUE COULD GENERALLY ACCEPT THESE IDEAS IF THEY WERE INCLUDED IN THE PARAGRAPH ON CONSULTATION (PARA 11) WITH SOME EDITING WHICH HE DID NOT DESCRIBE. FRENCH REPRESENTATIVE THOUGHT THAT THIS MIGHT BE A USEFUL DEVICE TO CONSOLIDATE DIFFICULT ISSUES IN ONE PARAGRAPH. US REP SUPPORTED THE LANGUAGE AS IT STOOD AND ARGUED FOR MAINTAINING IT IN ITS PRESENT LOCATION. SUPPORT FOR THIS LANGUAGE, HOWEVER, IS NOT WIDESPREAD AND MISSION BELIEVES THERE WOULD BE A SLIGHTLY IMPROVED CHANCE OF BROADENING THE BASIS OF SUPPORT FOR THIS TEXT IF IT WERE INCLUDED IN THE PARAGRAPH ON CONSULTATION. HOWEVER, THIS WOULD HAVE THE DISADVANTAGE OF OPENING UP YET ANOTHER ISSUE IN THE DELICATELY BALANCED COMPROMISE REPRESENTED BY THE BRITISH DRAFT. FOR THIS REASON, THE MISSION RECOMMENDS THAT WE STAND PAT ON THIS LANGUAGE AND MAINTAIN IT IN PARAGRAPH 5. SHOULD A GROUNDSWELL OF OPINION DEVELOP IN FAVOR OF MOVING THIS LANGUAGE TO THE PARAGRAPH ON CONSULTATION, WE WOULD PROPOSE TO ACCEPT THIS ONLY IF PRIOR CONSULTATION WITH KEY DELEGATIONS INDICATED THAT THIS WOULD NOT HAMPER REACHING AGREEMENT ON THE UK CONSULTATION PARAGRAPH.

D. PARAGRAPH 6- THE PROBLEM IN THIS PARAGRAPH IS THE
SECRET

PAGE 02 NATO 02953 02 OF 02 282250Z

DUTCH RESERVATION ABOUT THE DETERRENT ROLE ON UK AND FRENCH NUCLEAR FORCES. OTHER DELEGATIONS HAVE NOT SPOKEN TO THIS POINT. THE DUTCH WOULD BE ABLE TO ACCEPT THE SECOND BRACKETED ALTERNATIVE.

E. PARAGRAPH 7- THE LANGUAGE OF THIS PARAGRAPH CONTAINS THE WORD "DETERMINATION" IN PLACE OF THE WORD "COMMITMENT" IN KEEPING WITH THE DEPARTMENT'S GUIDANCE IN STATE 104606. HOWEVER, IN THE DISCUSSIONS BETWEEN THE UK AND FRENCH DELEGATION, THE LANGUAGE OF THE BALANCE OF THE PARAGRAPH INADVERTENTLY REVERTED TO THE ORIGINAL BRITISH TEXT. US REP DID NOT REOPEN THIS ISSUE AT SPC MEETING MAY 28 BUT MISSION BELIEVES THERE WILL BE NO DIFFICULTY IN INCORPORATING ALL US AMENDMENTS PROPOSED FOR THIS PARAGRAPH IN STATE 104606, AND WE PROPOSE TO DO THIS IN FURTHER CLEAN-UP WORK .

F. PARAGRAPH 8- THE TWO BRACKETED ALTERNATIVES AT THE END OF THIS PARAGRAPH REFLECT THE CONTINUING FRENCH DESIRE TO REMOVE SOME OF THE LIABILITIES WHICH THE FRENCH HAVE ALLEGED THEY SEE IN THE JUNE 22 AGREEMENT ON PREVENTION OF NUCLEAR WAR. US REP HAS OPPOSED THE FRENCH SENTANCE (FIRST BRACKETED ALTERNATIVE) AND THE FRENCH HAVE, SO FAR AS WE CAN DETERMINE, NO SUPPORT AMONG THE ALLIES FOR THEIR PROPOSAL. THE SECOND BRACKETED ALTERNATIVE IS, OF COURSE, US LANGUAGE TO WHICH DELEGATIONS

HAVE NOT NOTICEABLY RALLIED, ALTHOUGH THERE IS NO FIRM OPPOSITION TO IT SO FAR AS WE KNOW. MISSION WOULD APPRECIATE GUIDANCE AS TO WHETHER US SHOULD DROP ITS SENTENCE ON "RISK OF WAR" IF FRENCH ARE PREPARED TO DROP THEIR PROPOSAL. MISSION SUSPECTS, HOWEVER, THAT THIS PROBLEM IS LIKELY TO REMAIN WITH US UNTIL A NEW FRENCH GOVERNMENT IS FIRMLY IN PLACE AND IS CAPABLE OF SWITCHING SIGNALS ON THIS ISSUE.

4. PARAGRAPH 9

THE ISSUE HERE IS THE REFERNECE TO THE EVENTUAL CONTRIBUTION OF THE EC TO DEFENSE. UK OPPOSES THE REFERENCE. ALL ITS EC PARTNERS HAVE SUPPORTED INCLUSION WITH VARYING DEGREES OF ENTHUSIASM. MOST NON-EC ALLIES HAVE OPPOSED. US HAS STATED IT WILL BE GUIDED BY THE CONSENSUS THAT EMERGES. THE INSERTION OF THE PHRASE "TO THE INDIVISIBLE DEFENSE OF THE ALLIANCE" WAS AT THW SUGGESTION OF TURKEY.

5. PARAGRAPH 11

THE THREE BRACKETED ALTERNATIVES FOR THIS KEY PARAGRAPH ON CONSULTATIONS ARE THE BRITISH DRAFT, THE FRENCH DRAFT AS
SECRET

PAGE 03 NATO 02953 02 OF 02 282250Z

PROPOSED IN THE "THOUGHT GROUP" (2ND VERSION) AND THE ITALIAN REVISION OF THE BRITISH TEXT (3RD VERSION). RECOGNIZING THE DUNDAMENTAL NATURE OF THE USSUES INVOLVED IN THIS PARAGRAPH, SPC CONTENTED ITSELF WITH LAYINT OUT THE OPTIONS RATHER THAN DISCUSSING THE DIFFERING PHILOSOPHIES. US REP WAS ASKED IF HE WAS PREPARED TO DROP THE US CONSULTATIONS PARAGRAPH WHICH HAD BEEN DISCUSSED IN THE "THOUGHT GROUP." US REP STATED THAT HE WAS PREPARED TO DO SO AND TO SWING US SUPPORT BEHIND THE COMPROMISE BRUTISH DRAFT. WE WERE LATER INFORMED PRIVATELY THAT THIS EXCHANGE MAY HELP SOME ALLIES TO SWITCH THEIR SUPPORT TO THE BRITISH COMPROMISE. WE WERE ALSO TOLD PRIVATELY THAT THERE ARE INDICATIONS THAT THE ITALIANS, DESPITE THEIR EFFORTS TO AMEND THE BRITISH DRAFT, MAY MOVE TO SUPPORT THE BRITISH DRAFT AS THE BEST AVAILABLE SOLUTION.

6. PARAGRAPH 12

THE FOOTNAOTE TO THIS PARAGRAPH IS A REVISION OF THE FIRST SENTENCE OF THE ORIGINAL BRITISH TEXT PROPOSED BY DENMARK AND OPPOSED BY NO ONE. WE RECOMMEND ACCEPTANCE. THE LAST TWO SENTENCES ARE PRESENTED IN TWO ALTERNATIVE VERSIONS REFLECTING A FRENCH OBJECTION TO THE ALLIANCES RECOGNIZING A RESPONSIBLIITY FOR DEVELOPING COUNTRIES. AN EFFORT WAS MADE IN SPC TO STRESS THAT THIS WAS AN INDIVIDUAL RATHER THAN A COLLEVITIVE RESPONSIBILTY BUT THIS FAILED TO MOVE THE FRENCH REPRESENTATIVE. SUPPORT FOR THESE TWO ALTERNATIVES (FRENCH PREFERENCE IS FOR THE SECOND BRACKETED ALTERNATIVE) IS ABOUT EVENLY DIVIDED. MISSION WOULD APPRECIATE GUIDANCE ON IMPORTANT POINTS IN BRITISH TEXT WHICH WE SHOULD SEEK TO PRESERVE. FOR EXAMPLE, IS REFERENCE TO " AN OPEN AND EQUITABLE WORLD ECONOMIC SYSTEM" IMPORTANT TO MAINTAIN EVEN IF FUTURE DEBATE TAKES US IN THE DIRECTIONOF

COMPROMISES WHICH MIGHT OMIT THAT PHRASE?

7. PARAGRAPH -13

THIS IS THE PARAGRAPH ON PARLIAMENTARIANS PROPOSED BY THE
US CHAIRMAN OF SPC INQUIRED WHETHER ANYONE OPPOSED THIS US TEXT.
NO ONE INDICATED OPPOSITION AND NO ONE SPOKE TO THE ISSUE.
IT IS THEREFORE INCLUDED IN THE TEXT.

8. PARAGRAPH 14

THIS IS THE BRITISH TEXT AS AMENDED IN ACCORDANCE WITH
GUIDNACE CONTAINED REFTEL AND WITH THE INCLUSION OF THE WORK
SECRET

PAGE 04 NATO 02953 02 OF 02 282250Z

" LASTING" BEFORE"STRUCTURE OF PEACE" IN ACCORDNACE WITH A BRITISH
SUGGESTION. FRENCH REP EXPRESSED SOME UNHAPPINESS ABOUT THE
DRAFTING BUT AGREED TO REFER IT TO PARIS WITHOUT CHANGR.
RUMSFELD

SECRET

<< END OF DOCUMENT >>

Message Attributes

Automatic DecapTIONing: Z
Capture Date: 11 JUN 1999
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: n/a
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 28 MAY 1974
DecapTION Date: 28 MAY 2004
DecapTION Note: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Authority: garlanwa
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 28 MAY 2004
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1974ATO02953
Document Source: ADS
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: n/a
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: 11652 GDS
Errors: n/a
Film Number: n/a
From: NATO
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1974/newtext/t19740587/abbryveq.tel
Line Count: 291
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE
Office: n/a
Original Classification: SECRET
Original Handling Restrictions: EXDIS
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 6
Previous Channel Indicators:
Previous Classification: SECRET
Previous Handling Restrictions: EXDIS
Reference: STATE 110842
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Authority: garlanwa
Review Comment: n/a
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 09 APR 2002
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review History: RELEASED <09 APR 2002 by shawdg>; APPROVED <10-Sep-2002 by garlanwa>
Review Markings:

Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
30 JUN 2005

Review Media Identifier:
Review Referrals: n/a
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
Secure: OPEN
Status: NATIVE
Subject: NATO DECLARATION: COMMENTARY ON LATEST DRAFT
TAGS: PFOR, NATO
To: STATE INFO ALL NATO CAPITALS
Type: TE
Markings: Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005